



Final Report

Qualitative Research on Risk Communication Approaches to Animal Biotechnology

Health Canada

HCPOR-06-25

POR-310-06

Contract # H1011-060054/001/CY

(Contract Award Date – December 20, 2006)

February 2007

Ce rapport est aussi disponible en français.

Confidentiality

Any material or information provided by Health Canada and all data collected by Decima will be treated as confidential by Decima and will be stored securely while on Decima's premise (adhering to industry standards and applicable laws).



Decima Research

Significantly Different



Toronto

2345 Yonge Street
Suite 405
Toronto, Ontario
M4P 2E5

t: (416) 962-2013
f: (416) 962-0505

Ottawa

160 Elgin Street
Suite 1820
Ottawa, Ontario
K2P 2P7

t: (613) 230-2200
f: (613) 230-9048

Montreal

1080 Beaver Hall Hill
Suite 400
Montreal, Quebec
H2Z 1S8

t: (514) 288-0037
f: (514) 288-0138

Vancouver

21 Water Street
Suite 603
Vancouver, British Columbia
V6B 1A1

t: (604) 642-2295
f: (604) 642-2549

www.decima.com

info@decima.com

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Background.....	1
Objectives.....	2
Methodology	2
Executive Summary	4
Résumé	6
Detailed Findings	9
1. New Technologies.....	9
2. GM/GE Animals and Novel Foods	10
3. Communications Testing.....	14
Recommendations	16

Appendix A – Moderator’s Guide

Appendix B – Recruitment Screener

Introduction

Decima Research is pleased to present the following report to Health Canada. This report summarizes the results of a series of focus groups conducted to evaluate Canadians' awareness and knowledge of animal biotechnology and novel foods and to assess the most appropriate way to communicate information regarding the regulatory process of such.

Health Canada is interested in understanding the current depth of Canadians' knowledge and understanding of biotechnology and the regulation of biotechnology products. To that end, Decima Research was contracted to conduct research to evaluate desired vehicles and message types for future risk communications regarding biotechnology.

Background

Biotechnology is one area of science that has witnessed notable advancement in recent years. Biotechnology brings many new products and processes such as vaccines, genetically modified plants and food products, disease prognosis and treatments, and environmentally friendly bio-fuels. However, like any new technology there are potential benefits and risks.

Health Canada is the Federal department responsible for assessing the potential benefits, risks and impacts of biotechnology on Canadians' health and safety. More specifically, this government department regulates products resulting from biotechnology. In adherence to the *Food and Drug Act and Regulations*, Health Canada conducts rigorous safety assessments of each new product, including genetically modified (GM) food for human consumption, before it can be sold in Canada.

A leading example of GM food would be foods that are derived from animal biotechnology such as transgenic animals – where genes from one animal are inserted experimentally into the genes of the embryos of another. Currently, many Canadian biotechnologists are developing transgenic animals for future potential food use such as pigs and salmon. If food derived from transgenic animals passes Health Canada's thorough safety assessments, meaning it is found to not pose a risk to the health and safety of Canadians, this GM food will potentially be allowed for sale and distribution in Canada in the next 5 years or so.

The 2000 Federal budget allocated \$90 million to be used by Health Canada to boost scientific capacity of biotechnology, invest in its regulatory system, and to increase public involvement and awareness of the regulatory system as it relates to issues surrounding biotechnology.

Objectives

The purpose of this research is to identify what Canadians know and understand about biotechnology and the regulations that are in place to control biotechnology products in Canada. Furthermore, the research evaluates the most effective vehicles and message types for future risk communications. Ultimately, the results from this research will help guide the government in allocating funds to enhance its capacity for dealing with products derived from biotechnology.

Specific research objectives are to:

- Understand Canadians' attitudes towards animal biotechnology;
- Understand Canadians' knowledge concerning novel food regulations;
- Identify current sources of information used by Canadians concerning novel foods and animal biotechnology;
- Identify desired communications sources and vehicles to convey biotechnology information; and
- Identify desired content of communications materials.

Methodology

Six focus groups of 2 hours in length were conducted in the following three cities:

- Toronto (ON), January 16th 2007;
- Montreal (PQ), January 18th 2007; and
- Edmonton (AB), January 29th 2007.

The sessions in Montreal were led in French and the other sessions were held in English.

Within each city, one group was held with Involved Canadians, those who are more engaged in current events, and the other was held with the general population. For each group, 12 people were recruited with the aim of having eight to 10 participants in each group.

Decima Research designed and directed all elements of this research including design (screener and moderation guide), recruitment, moderation, analysis and reporting. The research tools and deliverables were approved by Health Canada and the documents were translated into French by Decima's in-house translation department.

This report begins with an executive summary highlighting key findings from the focus groups, followed by detailed results of the findings.

Any questions regarding this report can be directed to:

Jeff Walker

Senior Vice President
Decima Research Inc.
160 Elgin Street, Suite 1820
Ottawa, Ontario K2P 2C4
(613) 230-2013
jwalker@decima.com

Executive Summary

This report presents the results of focus groups evaluating Health Canada's communications on genetically modified and engineered food and animal regulations.

The following are the key results and conclusions from this research.

Overall, participants are very familiar with the term biotechnology and can typically list a number of examples of such developments. Involved Canadians are more aware of the concept of biotechnology and are therefore able to give a more comprehensive definition. Most have learned about biotechnology through the media, whether it is the Internet, newspapers or TV news coverage. It is clear that media is a vehicle that drives perceptions of this new technology. Throughout the groups, participants referred to high profile stories such as the Monsanto case, Celebrex and Thalidomide, and used these stories as analogies when stating their views on the subject.

Almost all participants indicated that they have heard something about GM/GE animals and food and a good number of participants were able to come up with an example top-of-mind, especially the Involved Canadians. Examples include store-bought turkeys being modified to have more white meat, and produce that is bigger and lasts longer. Some participants mistakenly cited the example of Dolly, not understanding the distinction between animal clones and GM/GE animals. Nobody had heard of the term *novel food*.

Generally, participants were concerned about the long term effects on humans and secondarily on the environment. Many expressed concern over potential health risks to humans and the fact that impacts of GM/GE products cannot be known in the short-term, before marketing them to consumers. Involved Canadians were generally more skeptical in terms of the concept of GM/GE foods and animals.

Involved Canadians were more skeptical than others about the motivations behind GM/GE products. Many believe that cost and profit are seen as the bottom line among producers (companies, farmers, government) and regulators (government, industry) of these products. This contrasts significantly with attitudes among Involved Canadians on other areas of genetic modification, where they tend to have more support for other applications involving biotechnology.

Participants were hard pressed to come up with benefits to GM/GE animal and food products. Although there was still a fair amount of concern, participants in the general population groups were more open to the benefits

of these products. This group was also more likely to be open to trying these new products. Interestingly, most benefits were associated with helping developing countries (i.e. growing crops resistant to insects so these countries don't have to spend money on pesticides), not to human health.

When asked about regulations that were in place to monitor and approve GM/GE products, most participants had an inclination there was some sort of process but were not able to describe what the process was. The exception is Montreal, where most were under the impression that producers could market GM/GE products without necessarily adhering to specific regulation processes.

Opinions were mixed among participants in terms how stringent the regulatory processes are. Some thought that the regulations and processes were stringent and government controlled, while others thought they were too lax and let products slide by without proper testing. Celebrex and Thalidomide were typically used as examples here.

Participants had mixed feelings about the brochure that was tested. Those who liked the brochure liked it because they learned something new. Many, especially those from the general population groups were surprised to learn the approval process took 7-10 years. Furthermore, some thought that with a few tweaks, it was an effective way to get exposure for the subject matter and to educate the public. However, a good number of participants, especially the Involved Canadians, took a very critical look at the material. These participants were skeptical about the technology itself which propelled further hesitation when it came to specific language usage. There were a couple of cases where the choice of language was pointed out as evidence of laxity on the part of the regulatory body. For instance, the phrases "voluntary labelling" and "Health Canada encourages proponents..." made participants feel uneasy and question how stringent the approval process really is.

Participants liked the idea of being able to know exactly what products have been approved for use in Canada as well as having the actual data and results of product tests available to them. Although they may not necessarily look at the results of the testing, participants liked the sense of transparency as it made them feel more comfortable knowing that it was available if needed.

Résumé

Le rapport présente les résultats des groupes de discussion effectués afin d'évaluer les communications de Santé Canada sur les règlements en matière d'aliments et d'animaux génétiquement modifiés et manipulés.

Les principaux résultats et les principales conclusions se trouvent ci-dessous.

Dans l'ensemble, les participants connaissent très bien le terme biotechnologie et sont habituellement capables de fournir de nombreux exemples de ses applications. Les Canadiens engagés connaissent mieux le concept de la biotechnologie que les autres participants et peuvent donc en donner une définition plus détaillée. La plupart des participants ont entendu parler de la biotechnologie dans les médias, qu'il s'agisse d'Internet, de journaux ou de reportages à la télévision. Il apparaît évident que les médias influencent les perceptions des gens à l'égard de cette nouvelle technologie. Durant les groupes, les participants ont fait référence aux cas très médiatisés de Monsanto, de Celebrex et de la Thalidomide et ils ont utilisé ces exemples pour faire des analogies lorsqu'ils ont exprimé leur opinion à ce sujet.

Presque tous les participants indiquent avoir entendu quelque chose au sujet des animaux et des aliments génétiquement modifiés ou manipulés. De plus, bon nombre d'entre eux, les Canadiens engagés en particulier, sont capables d'en fournir des exemples spontanément, par exemple les dindes achetées à l'épicerie qui sont génétiquement modifiées pour donner plus de viande blanche et les fruits et légumes dont la taille et la durée de vie sont supérieures. Certains participants ont cité par erreur l'exemple de Dolly, sans voir la différence entre les animaux clonés et les animaux génétiquement modifiés ou manipulés. Aucun participant n'avait entendu le terme *aliments nouveaux*.

De façon générale, les effets à long terme sur l'humain et, ensuite, sur l'environnement, préoccupent les participants. Que les risques potentiels sur la santé des humains et les effets possibles des produits génétiquement modifiés ne puissent pas être connus à court terme, c'est-à-dire avant leur commercialisation, inquiètent nombre d'entre eux. Les Canadiens engagés sont généralement plus sceptiques à l'égard du concept des animaux et des aliments génétiquement modifiés ou manipulés.

Les Canadiens engagés sont plus sceptiques que les autres sur les motivations derrière les produits génétiquement modifiés ou manipulés. De nombreux participants croient qu'en bout de piste, ce qui importe pour les producteurs (les sociétés, les agriculteurs, le gouvernement) et les autorités chargées de la réglementation de ces produits (le gouvernement, l'industrie)

sont les coûts et les profits. Ce point de vue tranche considérablement avec celui que les Canadiens engagés ont à l'égard d'autres domaines de la modification génétique, où ils appuient généralement davantage certaines autres applications qui font appel à la biotechnologie.

Les participants ont du mal à nommer les avantages des animaux et des aliments génétiquement modifiés ou manipulés. Les participants des groupes grand public sont plus réceptifs aux bienfaits de ces produits, bien qu'ils demeurent assez inquiets. Ces participants sont également plus susceptibles d'essayer ces nouveaux produits. Il est intéressant de noter qu'ils associent la plupart des bienfaits à l'aide aux pays en développement (p. ex. des cultures résistantes aux insectes afin d'éviter de devoir acheter des pesticides), et non à la santé humaine.

Concernant les règlements en place pour la surveillance et l'approbation des produits génétiquement modifiés ou manipulés, la plupart des participants sont tentés de dire qu'il existe un certain processus, sans toutefois pouvoir le décrire. Par contre, à Montréal, la plupart des participants ont l'impression que les producteurs pourraient commercialiser les produits génétiquement modifiés ou manipulés sans nécessairement devoir se conformer à des processus de réglementation particuliers.

Les opinions sont mitigées quant à la rigueur de ces processus de réglementation. Certains participants croient que les réglementations et les processus sont rigoureux et contrôlés par le gouvernement, tandis que d'autres les considèrent trop laxistes et disent qu'ils permettent l'approbation de produits qui n'ont pas subi tous les tests requis. Les cas du Celebrex et de la Thalidomide sont les exemples qu'ils utilisent habituellement pour appuyer leurs dires.

Les opinions des participants sont mitigées à l'égard du dépliant qui leur a été présenté. Les participants qui aiment le dépliant sont de cet avis parce qu'ils y ont appris quelque chose. De nombreux participants, particulièrement ceux des groupes grand public, sont surpris d'apprendre que la durée du processus d'approbation est de 7 à 10 ans. De plus, certains pensent qu'avec quelques modifications, le dépliant serait un moyen efficace de faire connaître ce domaine et de renseigner la population. Toutefois, un bon nombre de participants, en particulier les Canadiens engagés, jettent un œil très critique sur le dépliant. Ils sont sceptiques à l'égard de la technologie elle-même, ce qui les amène à hésiter encore plus lorsqu'il est précisément question du niveau de langue utilisé. À quelques occasions, le choix des mots est évoqué pour prouver le laxisme de l'organisme de réglementation. Par exemple, les expressions « étiquetage volontaire » et « Santé Canada encourage les promoteurs... » ne satisfont pas les participants et les amènent à douter de la rigueur réelle du processus d'approbation.

Les participants aiment l'idée de pouvoir savoir exactement quels produits ont été autorisés au Canada et d'avoir accès aux données et aux résultats des tests effectués sur les produits. Bien que les participants ne regarderaient pas nécessairement les résultats des tests, ils aiment cette transparence, car il est rassurant pour eux de savoir que ces renseignements sont accessibles au besoin.

Detailed Findings

This section of the report describes the detailed findings from the focus groups. In the first subsection, the scene is set for the discussion by presenting findings from the groups' introductory section on new technologies and more specifically biotechnology. The second subsection deals with GM/GE animals, food and novel foods; the third addresses the communications testing of the brochure. The subsequent section delves into various recommendations based on trends that arose throughout the focus groups.

1. New Technologies

Top of mind discussion regarding new technologies yielded identification of various technologies mainly clustered around the health sphere. Generally, participants recall hearing or seeing information about new medical advancements such as the artificial heart, genome research for Alzheimer's and the advancement of transplanting fully functioning limbs such as a hand. However, participants are not as likely to make the connection between new technologies and biotechnology. A few participants, particularly in the Involved Canadians focus groups, mentioned advancements such as stem cell research and cloning, and even then they did not refer to these applications as "biotechnology", they are viewed more as health and medical issues.

Virtually all participants are aware of the term *biotechnology*; however it is not typically top of mind when thinking of new technologies. When asked whether or not they had heard of the term biotechnology, every participant indicated they had; however, there were varying levels of understanding and awareness. In general, when thinking about this sphere, people make connections with specific applications, or categories of applications, rather than the word biotechnology itself. So while awareness of the field is actually quite high when people engage in a discussion, people do not always make a connection to the word "biotechnology" when initially asked about it.

A good number of participants in all three cities were able to give some sort of definition of biotechnology, however, Involved Canadians seemed to be more aware of the concept and were therefore more comfortable than the general population groups to give a complete definition. Generally, the definition involved the words "manipulation", "genetics", "harvesting" and "living organism". Beyond the definition, participants used examples such as stem cell research, tissue regeneration and plant suicide genes, to further explain the concept of biotechnology.

The Internet, newspapers and TV news coverage are common sources of information on biotechnology. Furthermore, this media exposure typically guides peoples' perceptions about biotechnology. Most participants admitted to knowing little about the specifics of biotechnology, but what they do know they learned through some form of media. For example, participants in every group mentioned either the Monsanto case, Celebrex or Thalidomide. These high profile news stories seem to help form perceptions regarding biotechnology among participants, and it is clear that these stories serve as analogies when participants describe their views on the subject.

2. GM / GE Animals and Novel Foods

Awareness

Genetically modified (GM) and genetically engineered (GE) food and animals are concepts that are relatively familiar to people. However, novel food is not a concept that people are familiar with. When prompted, most participants were able to say that they had at least heard something about GM or GE food and animals and a good number were able to provide an example of such technology (i.e. longer lasting produce, modified turkeys that produce more white meat etc.). Some participants mistakenly cited the example of Dolly, not understanding the distinction between animal clones and GM/GE animals. Involved Canadians were slightly more knowledgeable in terms of understanding the process of GM / GE foods and animals, however, like the general population groups, participants generally rely on examples to help explain the concept.

Novel food on the other hand, does not have the same level of awareness. In fact, there were no participants who had heard of the term novel food. Even upon prompting, there was still no recognition of the term novel food.

Benefits and Risks

Participants were read a list of recent developments in the GM animal and food sphere and in the biomedical sphere (i.e. Cows resistant to BSE, cattle with better meat quality, the Enviropig, GE insects to control mosquitoes from spreading West Nile virus) and were asked to discuss their thoughts on these developments.

Not surprisingly, there is a sense of hesitation toward the concept of GM/GE foods and animals. When asked to discuss their thoughts and feelings surrounding the concept of GM/GE products, numerous concerns came forward, including ethical and moral dilemmas and the concern that we

*"Where do we draw the line?
This is going much further
and seems scary and it
interferes with nature."*

General population, Toronto

"We're messing with Mother Nature...and inherently that's just bad."

Involved Canadian, Toronto

are "messing with Mother Nature". Involved Canadians demonstrated strong feelings toward the potential risks of genetically modified food and animals, more so than the general population participants. Concerns over the potential long-term negative effects on the health of humans and the ecosystem, animals and the reproduction or extinction of certain species were widely expressed, especially among Involved Canadians. Nevertheless, there were a few participants that were less disparaging because they assumed that some sort of controls or measures are in place to address the negative effects of GM/GE products.

The biggest concern, however, revolved around the fact that genetic modification and engineering is a relatively new concept, and participants feel that there is not enough information and research done to ensure that GM/GE products are actually safe for human use and consumption. Participants in all three cities brought up the point that there is an unknown when it comes to long-term outcomes and impacts. They are skeptical about how these products will impact humans in the future, after years of being exposed to these products.

Furthermore, some participants expressed concern over the speed at which GM/GE research is being done. Their feeling is that GM/GE research needs to be done over a long period of time (participants eluded to a range of 25 years down the road) in order to assure that the product is safe for humans.

When making the comparison between GM/GE animal and foods, there is no doubt that GM/GE animals is an area that engenders higher levels of concern than GM/GE food and crops. Some believe that modifying animals is morally and ethically problematic, more so than modifying food and crops. Furthermore, one participant in Montreal articulated his concern with GM/GE foods and animals for human use because there are more risks to human health, where as environment use of these products have a decreased health risk.

"I don't necessarily trust that the Canadian government is looking out for Canadian values. Is there value in a purple cow?"

Involved Canadian, Toronto

There is quite a bit of skepticism toward the motivations behind GM/GE products and it all comes down to profit. In all three cities, participants questioned the motives behind the development of GM/GE products. Involved Canadians were much more skeptical about the scientists and the companies backing these products and question their reasoning for marketing them. Essentially, cost and profit are seen as the motivator, and these participants claim that people who market these products are only looking out for their best interests, not the best interests of human beings.

Although there was an overarching feeling of hesitation and concern over GM/GE animals and food, a good number of participants adopted a pacifist

attitude regarding the subject. Despite the group's strong views against this technology, they realize that at some point in time they will have, or have already, consumed a GM/GE product likely without knowing it. A few participants in Toronto and Montreal made the point that consumers are currently eating products that are made up of chemical ingredients which to them poses the question "why would GM/GE foods be any different"?

"The end goal for these products is to benefit human health, and if they say it's better for me, why wouldn't I try it?"

General Population, Montreal

There is a fair amount of concern; however, people do see the upside to GM/GE products. Participants in the general population groups were much more open to the idea of GM/GE products when compared to Involved Canadians. The exception was in Edmonton, where Involved Canadians seemed to be less concerned with the risks of GM/GE products compared to Involved Canadians in Toronto and Montreal.

Benefits of GM/GE animals and food tend to be humanitarian in nature. Interestingly, when asked what kind of benefits could result from this kind of research, most responses revolved around ways in which GM/GE products could help developing countries. For example, one participant suggested that using corn that is resistant to insects would be beneficial for developing countries because money would be saved on pesticides, and the crop would be successful to feed more people. With the exception of a few participants mentioning the benefits of convenience and lifestyle, virtually no participants mentioned beneficial impacts of GM/GE animals and food to humans. For instance, someone in Toronto commented that modifying turkeys to produce more white meat is a benefit to consumers' lifestyle because a lot of people *prefer* white meat over dark meat. This type of GM product is not a necessity which is why the participant considered it a benefit of convenience and lifestyle.

By and large, participants in the general population groups were more inclined to see the benefits of the products and many indicated that they would be open to trying the products.

Regulation

Participants were asked whether or not they thought there were processes in place to regulate GM/GE animal and food products and furthermore, what kinds of processes they expected to be in place.

In Toronto and Edmonton, participants felt that there must be some kind of regulatory process, however opinions were mixed in terms of who would be involved or how stringent the regulations would be. Some thought regulations and processes would be rigid and controlled by the government, while others thought that the process would be more lax. Conversely, Montreal participants generally did not think that there were any

specific regulation or approval processes in place for GM/GE animal and food products. These participants were under the impression that companies were able to market such products without necessarily adhering to specific regulation processes.

"Who's looking over [the government's] shoulder?"

Involved Canadian, Edmonton

Involved Canadians seemed to be more cynical about the regulatory process compared to general population participants. More specifically, this group of participants tend to be more critical about the government or industry's role in the process, mainly because of their perceptions that these bodies by and large are more concerned with profit than concern towards human health. For instance, one participant in Toronto expressed concern over the circumstances of product testing and says that it is "easier to beg forgiveness than ask permission".

Unlike Involved Canadians who are skeptical of the motivations behind government regulation and the approval process, participants in the general population groups took a more optimistic standpoint. These participants were more likely to feel that it's the responsibility of the government to supervise GM/GE products and ensure the safety of these products when they hit the market for consumer use.

It was clear that participants were not drawing their assessments from information about the system that regulated GM/GE products. In fact, participants were drawing their assessments from other areas of government regulation (i.e. drug assessments and approval process) and making analogies from those assessments toward GM/GE products. For example, some compared their impressions of the regulatory processes of GM/GE products to other products. Unfortunately, these analogies tended to be about areas of growing concern such as the pharmaceutical regulatory approval process.

Despite perceptions of current processes, it is expected that some sort of legislation or regulations would be in place if not for any other reason than safety to humans. Although there was some hesitation in terms of the role the government plays in the regulation process, a good number of participants suggested that the government was a more appropriate body to be involved with this process, compared to a private company. Health Canada was mentioned by some as being the best candidate to regulate and approve such products.

Having access to detailed findings and reports would likely help people feel more confident about the regulatory process. Almost all participants indicated that having access to the details of the GM/GE product testing and approval process would be of interest. Many participants said that it would make them feel better just knowing that the results were available to the

public. This does not mean that people would necessarily read the reports, however it demonstrates transparency on behalf of the regulatory body and therefore boosts their confidence.

3. Communications Testing

As part of the communications testing exercise, participants were given copies of a brochure produced by Health Canada on GM food and asked to discuss various subject areas, themes, and messaging language that they found helpful and unhelpful.

Evaluation of Brochure

The brochure received mixed reviews from participants. Those who liked the brochure liked it because it provided new information on the subject matter and they felt like they learned something. For instance, a number of participants mentioned that it made them feel more comfortable with the process once they learned that the approval process takes 7-10 years. Many commented on the depth of information provided and the fact that it depicts stringent practices used by the government during the approval practice. A few commented that it looked like a typical government document and was too long to read but the majority felt that the information was well presented. Typically, participants in the general population groups provided more positive feedback.

Compared to participants in the general population groups, Involved Canadians used a more critical eye when reading through the brochure.

This group seemed to take a critical look at the material due to their skepticism about GM/GE technology itself. More specifically, Involved Canadians scrutinized over the language used in the brochure. They were quick to judge the regulatory system as lax where the language appeared to be evasive. For example, they did not like the term “voluntary labelling” as it gave the impression that there was something to hide.

Involved Canadians were not the only ones critiquing the language used in the brochure. Participants in the general population groups also commented on certain words that left them feeling slightly hesitant about the regulatory process – “voluntary labelling” being one of them. Also, the word “encourages” under the section entitled “Pre-submission consultation” left a good number of participants feeling uneasy and questioning how stringent the approval process really is.

Participants generally felt that the government should be more proactive in terms of disseminating information about the regulation of GM/GE animal and food products. Among those who liked the brochure, displaying it at medical clinics, grocery stores and schools would be useful and would expose consumers to the issues. Many participants also felt that

“I’d rather [the regulatory body] be the government than industry...I don’t trust industry”

General Population, Edmonton

using different media such as television and newspaper ads would broaden the reach and would therefore have a better success rate at informing consumers, more so than just the brochure.

Highlighted below are some insights about the brochure as a risk communications tool:

- It provides a good overview of information, in a language that is relatively easy enough for the Canadian general population to understand;
- The brochure itself has enough information to provide people with an overall understanding of the approval process, however for many it is too much information to read at once;
- There are some word choices that seem to undermine the credibility of the regulatory approval process more so than it does to support it (i.e. “voluntary labelling”, “Health Canada encourages proponents...”, “...intended use”);
- There is an interest in having more information in the brochure that speaks to accountability for the approval process and information on the post-approval stage such as monitoring or on-going testing.

Recommendations

Based on the discussions heard in the six focus groups, we recommend the following:

1. **The main goal in terms of risk communications should be to help enhance the credibility of the approval process, and those involved in the approval process.** There is little doubt that applications of animal biotechnology are controversial, and that Canadians have concerns about them. But the groups were clear that Health Canada is not responsible to defend these technologies, its role needs to focus on the aspects of these technologies that it controls – the regulatory approval process.

These results suggest that few know much about how regulatory approval processes work. It is really important for Health Canada to position itself as an organization whose role is to evaluate the safety of all food products that it comes across, and be value-neutral about those products.

More effort to discuss the nature of the process, its key elements, and the typical timeframe of approvals, will help to give Canadians a sense of assurance that there is appropriate attention being paid to these issues – and that is their expectation from government on this issue. Furthermore, talking about the scientific credentials of those involved in these assessments, as well as the scope of the approval organization itself (ie. the number of PhD scientists working in regulatory affairs) will also help to lend assurance to Canadians that government is on the issue. Discussing the benefits of GM/GE products, particularly animal biotechnology products is controversial, and Canadians do not expect Health Canada to have a position about these products above and beyond the question of their safety.

2. **Using unequivocal language when describing key issues would help reassure individuals about the efficacy of the regulatory process.** Throughout all six groups, we heard participants question how stringent the regulatory process of GM/GE products, triggered in many cases by certain words they observed in the brochure and in the moderator's guide. These words, which give the connotation of laxity, or voluntary participation, or vagueness in terms of Health Canada's role, undermine its credibility, and increase the sense of risk they have about the products and the regulatory process. Where possible, documents targeted for the public, should avoid using words such as "voluntary" and "encourages" or it should focus on what is mandatory in order to provide individuals with more confidence in the regulatory process.

3. **Highlighting the international nature of the testing, research and the collaboration that occurs among other countries would also be beneficial for communications.** This would add credibility to the technology and to Health Canada's role in the regulatory process as it demonstrates the organization's world leading role and expertise.
4. **Defining the approval process in more detail, with particular reference to various elements of the process and the length of time, would be useful.** Participants associate length of time of study and credibility of the regulatory process. Highlighting the details of the regulatory process and the length of time needed to thoroughly address all of the elements in the approval system adds even more integrity to the overall process.
5. **Describing the differences between modern and traditional forms of biotechnology is important to do, and it is an appropriate and potentially helpful role for government to play.** While most people see them differently, there is enough of a connection that makes people recognize that foods they eat now have been influenced by biotechnology in one form or another.
6. **The word "novel" food is something that is not well known, and tends to yield more discomfort than comfort with the products.** The term novel food is a term that describes the way in which the scientific community refers to GM/GE products, however using this language may actually hinder the credibility of the process more than help it. The term novel food is not recognized by the general population, and to some, it is viewed as a euphemism, a word that "big companies" use to soften the words GM or GE. While it may be helpful in an ideal world to attempt to explain this term to the general public, it is not clear that the negative perceptions can be undone by regulatory authorities attempting to communicate about it – and that by using it often in communications, there may be more risk or concern brought to bear in regard to regulatory processes.
7. **Highlighting the transparency of the regulatory process would help reassure the general public.** Participants liked the idea of being able to know exactly what products have been approved for use in Canada, and having the actual data and results available to them. Although the language would be technical, and some admitted that they may not actually read it, participants felt comforted that the information was there just in case they wanted to read it. Including the names of other countries that have approved the same applications would also be good to include in Health Canada's communications.

Appendix A – Moderator's Guide

Moderator's Guide (Final)

Health Canada Risk Communication on Animal Biotech Focus Groups

1. Warm up

(5)

The moderator will take a few minutes to introduce himself and to go around the table and ask respondents to introduce themselves, and will outline a few ground rules for the discussion:

- Want to ensure that people share their views openly and honestly.
- Want people to talk about their views, not "other people's views".
- No right or wrong answers.
- Everyone's views are valid.
- The moderator's job is to ensure that we stay on topic.
- Reinforce the message that the moderator has no stake in the results.

The moderator will also point out that there is a one-way mirror, observers in the back, and audio/video taping, but ensure that all discussion is entirely confidential.

2. Introduction

(15)

Tonight we are going to talk about new technologies. To start things off, I would like you to talk to me about some of the new technologies that you know of / are aware of.

1. ▪ How are they changing our world, the things we do, the treatments for our health, the products we use?
2. ▪ Have you heard of the word biotechnology?
3. a. ▪ What does it mean? 3. b. ▪ What does it encompass? -3b
4. a. ▪ Is it a subject you know a lot about, a little about, or not much about? -4a

4b { **Biotech Definition:** a term that encompasses a broad spectrum of scientific applications used in many sectors, such as health, natural resources, and agriculture. It involves the use of living organisms, or parts of living organisms, to provide new methods of production and make new products. Related to biotechnology are the areas of life sciences, genetic modification and genomics.

5. ▪ Biotechnology has applications in a number of fields. Can you recall any that you have heard of?
6. ▪ Is it a subject you know a lot about, a little about, or not much about?
7. a. ▪ Where do you get your information about it? 7a
7b

10

8ab 8a **GM Definition:** An organism (plant, animal, and bacterium) is considered genetically modified if its genetic material has been altered through any method, including conventional breeding, resulting in a novel trait (ex. Insect resistance, modified nutritional content, etc.).

8b **GE Definition:** An organism is considered genetically engineered if it was genetically modified using techniques that permit the direct transfer or removal of genes in that organism. Such techniques are also called recombinant DNA or rDNA techniques.

Tonight we are going to discuss one particular aspect of these emerging technologies, GM animals and foods derived from them.

3. Awareness of GM Food and GM Animals

(20)

⑦ 9a→g Now I'd like to get more specific and talk about GM food and GM animals. Has anyone here heard of these terms before? 9b 9c 1a

- What do they mean? What do they encompass?
- What do you know about GM food and GM animals? 9d
- Is it a subject you know a lot about, a little about, or not much about? 9c
- Where do you get your information about it? How did you learn about it? 9f 9g

10a→c

Has anyone heard of the term novel food? 10g
▪ What do you know about novel foods? 10b

For those of you who don't know, novel foods are defined as:

10c

- Foods resulting from a process not previously used for food.
- Products that do not have a history of safe use as a food.
- Foods that have been genetically modified, as per my previous definition, also known as genetically modified foods, GM foods. It also includes genetically engineered foods or biotechnology-derived foods.

At this point in time, there are no foods derived from GM animals on the market. However, research is currently being done on GM animals, in the food area and in the biomedical area. Some examples of this research include:

FOOD USE:

7x4=28

- 11a→d ▪ Development of chicken that is resistant to disease
- 12a→d ▪ Development of GM cows resistant to BSE
- 13a→d ▪ Development of cows that are GM to produce less fat or that produce healthy fatty acids such as omega-3s or higher levels of protein in their milk
- 14a→d ▪ Development of GM pigs that are environmentally-friendly (Enviropig)
- 15a→d ▪ Development of cattle with better meat quality

NON-FOOD USE:

- 16a→d ▪ Development of GM cows to for medical and bio-medical use (to produce drugs in their milk at lower cost to consumers).
- 17a→d ▪ GE insects to control mosquitoes from spreading West Nile Virus

40

For each of the above the moderator will probe on the following questions:

- voir p 20.*
- a. What do you think of this development?
 - b. What are the benefits of this kind of research?
 - c. And what do you see as the major risks involved?
 - d. In terms of the moral or ethical aspect of this concept, what are your views?

4. Regulation of GM Food and GM Animals

(35)

Moving on now, in terms of novel food / GM animal products, do you think that someone could just develop and market a product? Do you expect there to be a process? *18a*

(7) 18a → g

- What are your expectations? *18c*
- Do you think there are regulations / processes in place? *18d*
- And do you think that the government of Canada processes / regulations are stringent or not all that stringent? *18e*
- What, if any, are some of the risks or concerns you have about novel food / GM animals? *18f*
- Do you think the government should take control of these risks / concerns or is the government already addressing them? *18g*

Common info 19a I have a hand-out that I will pass out to each one of you. It gives a summary of how novel foods / GM animals get approved. [Hand-out summary description provided by HC] I'd like you to take about 5 minutes to read it over and then we'll discuss your thoughts.

(8) 19a → h

- What are your overall impressions? *19b*
- From what you read, what do you think of the regulation process? Do you think the process is stringent or lax? *19d*
- How confident would you say you are in the safety and regulatory approval systems governing GM food and animals in Canada? Why do you say that? *19e*
- Do you think it would be useful for the general public to have access to test results? Would this ease any concerns you may have? *19g*

(15)

5. Communications

(35)

For the remainder of this session, I'd like us to talk about communicating information about novel foods and GM animals.

- ① 20
- ② 21a → c
 - So far this evening, you've had a brief overview of novel foods and GM animals. What else do you want to know about these concepts? ^{21a} ^{21b} ^{21c}
 - What types of information would interest you? Safety of products? List of approved products? ^{22a}
 - If you were going to look up more information about novel foods or GM animals, where would you go? Information telephone line? Internet? What web sites? ^{22b} ^{22c} ^{22d}
 - Are there certain information sources that you would trust more than others? Who? Which ones? ^{23a} ^{23b} ^{23c}
 - ① 24
 - ③ 25a → e
 - Who or what organization would be most credible to regulate and distribute information about novel foods or GM animals?
 - What would be the most effective way to get information on novel foods / GM animals? What types of tools? Brochures? Posters? Commercials? ^{25a} ^{25b} ^{25c} ^{25d} ^{25e}

Now, I'm going to hand out a brochure. This brochure is not specific to what we spoke about tonight, but I'd like to use it as an example of how information could be communicated to you about these topics. I'll give you a few minutes to read it over quickly. [Pass out brochures]

- ② 26ab
 - What do you think about this brochure? Is that an effective way to communicate this information? ^{26a} ^{26b}
 - ⑥ 27a → f
 - What did you like about the brochure? What didn't you like? ^{27a} ^{27b}
 - Format? ^{27c}
 - Length? ^{27d} ^{27e}
 - Language used? Too technical? ^{27f}
 - ① 28
 - How could it be improved?

6. Conclusions / wrap-up

(10)

Before wrapping up the group, the moderator will come back to the viewing room and check to see if there are any questions or areas the client(s) would like asked or explored further.

1 29

27

Guide de discussion (final)

Groupes de discussion sur la communication des risques associés à la biotechnologie animale – Santé Canada

1. Entrée en matière

(5)

Le modérateur prendra quelques minutes pour se présenter, faire un tour de table et demander aux participants de se présenter. Il mentionnera ensuite quelques règles de bases pour la discussion :

- Il doit faire en sorte que tous puissent exprimer leurs points de vue ouvertement et en toute honnêteté.
- Il faut que chacun exprime son point de vue personnel et non celui « des autres ».
- Il n'y a pas de bonnes ou de mauvaises réponses.
- Tous les points de vue sont valables.
- Le rôle du modérateur est de faire en sorte que l'on ne s'égare pas dans des discussions futiles.
- Le modérateur est indépendant et n'a aucun parti pris.

Le modérateur informera ensuite les participants qu'il y a un miroir d'observation derrière lequel se trouvent certaines personnes et que l'on fera un enregistrement audiovisuel de la discussion, mais il les assurera également que toute la discussion demeurera confidentielle.

2. Introduction

(15)

Ce soir, nous discuterons de nouvelles technologies. Pour commencer, j'aimerais que vous me parliez des nouvelles technologies que vous connaissez ou dont vous avez déjà entendu parler.

- Comment ces nouvelles technologies changent-elles la société, ce que nous faisons, les traitements médicaux, les produits que nous utilisons?
- Avez-vous déjà entendu parler de la biotechnologie?
- Pouvez-vous m'en donner une définition? Qu'est-ce que la biotechnologie englobe?
- Est-ce un sujet que vous connaissez très bien, un peu ou pas vraiment?

Biotechnologie : ce terme englobe un vaste éventail d'applications scientifiques utilisées dans de nombreux domaines comme la santé, les ressources naturelles et l'agriculture. La biotechnologie fait appel à l'utilisation d'organismes vivants, ou de certaines parties de ces organismes, dans le but de mettre au point de nouveaux procédés et de créer de nouveaux produits. La biotechnologie regroupe notamment les sciences de la vie, la génétique et la génomique.

- La biotechnologie a des applications dans de nombreux domaines. De quelles applications avez-vous déjà entendu parler?
- Est-ce un sujet que vous connaissez très bien, un peu ou pas vraiment?
- Où obtenez-vous de l'information sur le sujet? Comment en avez-vous entendu parler?

Génétiquement modifié : Un organisme, comme une plante, un animal ou une bactérie, est considéré comme génétiquement modifié si son matériel génétique a été altéré par quelque méthode que ce soit, y compris la reproduction classique, pour lui conférer de nouveaux traits (ex. résistance aux insectes, valeur nutritive modifiée, etc.).

Génétiquement manipulé : Un organisme est considéré comme génétiquement manipulé s'il a été génétiquement modifié au moyen de techniques qui permettent le transfert direct ou le retrait de gènes dans cet organisme. Ces techniques sont également connues sous les noms de techniques de l'ADN recombinant ou rADN.

La discussion de ce soir portera principalement sur un aspect de ces technologies en émergence : les animaux génétiquement modifiés et les aliments qui en sont dérivés.

1. Connaissances des aliments et des animaux génétiquement modifiés (20)

Rentrons dans le vif du sujet. Certains d'entre vous ont-ils déjà entendu parler d'aliments ou d'animaux génétiquement modifiés?

- Que signifient ces termes? Qu'englobent-ils?
- Que savez-vous des aliments et des animaux génétiquement modifiés?
- Est-ce un sujet que vous connaissez très bien, un peu ou pas vraiment?
- Où obtenez-vous de l'information à ce sujet? Comment en avez-vous entendu parler?

Avez-vous déjà entendu parler des aliments nouveaux?

- Que savez-vous des aliments nouveaux?

Pour ceux qui ne le savent pas, les aliments nouveaux sont :

- *Des aliments issus de procédés qui n'ont pas été appliqués auparavant aux aliments.*
- *Des produits qui ne présentent pas d'antécédent d'innocuité comme aliments.*
- *Des aliments qui ont été génétiquement modifiés conformément à la définition que je vous ai donnée plus tôt. Ils comprennent les aliments génétiquement manipulés et les aliments issus de la biotechnologie.*

À l'heure actuelle, aucun aliment dérivé d'animaux génétiquement modifiés ne se retrouve sur le marché. Toutefois, les animaux génétiquement modifiés font l'objet de recherches, notamment dans le domaine de l'alimentation et de la biomédecine. En voici quelques exemples :

UTILISATION ALIMENTAIRE :

- Produire des poulets résistants aux maladies
- Produire des vaches génétiquement modifiées résistantes à l'ESB
- Produire des vaches génétiquement modifiées afin de produire moins de graisse ou afin de produire des acides gras sains, par exemple des oméga 3, ou des taux plus élevés de protéines dans leur lait
- Produire des porcs génétiquement modifiés pour les rendre écologiques (enviroporcs)
- Produire des bœufs dont la viande serait de meilleure qualité

UTILISATION NON ALIMENTAIRE :

- Produire des vaches génétiquement modifiées à des fins médicales et biomédicales (qui produiraient dans leur lait des médicaments à coût moindre pour les consommateurs).
- Produire des insectes génétiquement modifiés pour contrer la propagation du virus du Nil occidental

Pour chacun des exemples précédents, le modérateur pose les questions suivantes :

- Que pensez-vous de ces développements?
- Quels avantages tire-t-on de ces recherches?
- Et quels sont les principaux risques associés à ces recherches, selon vous?
- Que pensez-vous de l'aspect moral ou éthique de ce concept?

1. Réglementation des aliments et des animaux génétiquement modifiés (35)

Passons maintenant aux produits comme les aliments nouveaux et les animaux génétiquement modifiés. Croyez-vous qu'il soit possible de tout simplement développer de tels produits et de les mettre sur le marché? Vous attendez-vous à ce qu'il y ait un certain processus à suivre?

- Quelles sont vos attentes?
- Croyez-vous qu'il existe une réglementation ou des processus en place?
- Et croyez-vous que la réglementation et les processus adoptés par le gouvernement du Canada sont rigoureux ou laxistes?
- Le cas échéant, quels risques ou préoccupations les aliments nouveaux et les animaux génétiquement modifiés représentent-ils?
- Croyez-vous que le gouvernement devrait s'attaquer à ces risques et à ces préoccupations ou si vous croyez-vous qu'il s'y attaque déjà?

Je vais vous distribuer un document expliquant le processus d'approbation des aliments nouveaux et des animaux génétiquement modifiés. [Résumé descriptif fourni par Santé Canada] Je vous demanderais de prendre 5 minutes pour le lire, puis nous en discuterons.

- Quelles sont vos impressions globales?
- D'après votre lecture, que pensez-vous du processus d'approbation réglementaire? Croyez-vous que le processus est rigoureux ou laxiste?
- Quelle confiance avez-vous dans les systèmes de sécurité et d'approbation réglementaire auxquels sont assujettis les aliments et les animaux génétiquement modifiés au Canada? Pourquoi dites-vous cela?
- À votre avis, serait-il utile que le grand public ait accès aux résultats de ces tests? Cela apaiserait-il certaines de vos préoccupations?

1. Communications**(35)**

Pour le reste de la discussion, j'aimerais que nous abordions le sujet de la communication de l'information sur les aliments nouveaux et les animaux génétiquement modifiés.

- Ce soir, vous avez eu un bref aperçu de ce que sont les aliments nouveaux et les animaux génétiquement modifiés. Que souhaiteriez-vous savoir d'autre sur ces concepts?
- Quels types de renseignements vous intéresseraient? Des renseignements sur l'innocuité des produits? La liste des produits approuvés?
- Si vous vouliez trouver de l'information sur les aliments nouveaux et les animaux génétiquement modifiés, où chercheriez-vous? Une ligne d'information téléphonique? Internet? Quels sites Web?
- Feriez-vous confiance à certaines sources d'information plus qu'à d'autres? Lesquelles?
- Quelle personne ou quelle organisation aurait le plus de crédibilité pour régler les aliments nouveaux et les animaux génétiquement modifiés et diffuser de l'information à ce sujet?
- Quelle serait la façon la plus efficace pour obtenir de l'information sur les aliments nouveaux et les animaux génétiquement modifiés? Quels types d'outils? Des dépliants? Des affiches? Des publicités?

Je vais maintenant vous distribuer un dépliant. Il ne concerne pas précisément ce dont nous avons parlé ce soir, mais j'aimerais quand même l'utiliser à titre d'exemple de moyen de communication qui nous permettrait de vous informer sur ces sujets. Je vous demanderais de prendre quelques minutes pour le parcourir rapidement. [Distribuer le dépliant]

- Que pensez-vous de ce dépliant? S'agit-il d'un moyen de communication efficace?
- Qu'aimez-vous de ce dépliant? Qu'aimez-vous moins?
 - Le format?
 - La longueur?
 - Le niveau de langue? Trop technique?
- Comment pourrait-on l'améliorer?

2. Conclusion**(10)**

Avant de clore le groupe de discussion, le modérateur ira dans la salle d'observation pour vérifier si les clients ont d'autres questions ou s'ils souhaitent approfondir certains points.

Appendix B – Recruitment Screener

Decima (HC Animal Biotech 2007 Groups)

Questionnaire # _____	Date of Last Group _____ # of previous groups _____
City: Toronto (English) Tuesday January 16, 2007 Group #1: Gen Pop @5:30pm 1 \$75.00 Group #2: Involved Canadians @7:30pm 2 \$75.00	Rec. 10 Honorarium: \$75.00
City: Montreal (French) Thursday January 18, 2007 Group #3: Gen Pop @5:30pm 3 \$75.00 Group #4: Involved Canadians @7:30pm 4 \$75.00	Study # _____ LD Code: _____
City: Edmonton (English) Monday January 29, 2007 Group #5: Gen Pop @5:30pm 5 \$75.00 Group #6: Involved Canadians @7:30pm 6 \$75.00	
Respondent's name: _____ Respondent's phone #: _____ (home) Respondent's phone #: _____ (work) Respondent's fax #: _____ sent? _____ or Respondent's e-mail : _____ sent? Sample source (circle): random referral	Interviewer: _____ Date: _____ Validated: _____ Quality Central: _____ On List: _____ On Quotas: _____

Hello, my name is _____. I'm calling from OSI Focus Search, a national public opinion research firm. We're organizing a couple of discussion groups among residents to explore public opinions regarding current issues. **EXPLAIN FOCUS GROUPS.** About ten people like yourself will be taking part, all of them randomly recruited by telephone just like you. But before we invite you to attend, we need to ask you a few questions to ensure that we get a good mix and variety of people. May I ask you a few questions?

Yes **CONTINUE**
No **ASK IF ANYONE ELSE IN THE HOUSEHOLD MIGHT BE INTERESTED**
IF NOT THANK AND TERMINATE

IF PARTICIPANTS ASK ABOUT THE LEGITIMACY OF THE RESEARCH: You may contact [insert HC contact] at [insert number and email] for more information about these discussion groups.

Participation is voluntary. We are interested in hearing your opinions, no attempt will be made to sell you anything or change your point of view. The format is a "round table" discussion lead by a research professional.

- 1a) Do you or any member of your household work for....
- | | |
|--|---|
| The federal or provincial government | 1 |
| A media outlet, like a newspaper, radio or TV station | 2 |
| An advertising, public relations or market research firm | 3 |

IF "YES" TO ANY OF THE ABOVE, THANK AND TERMINATE

- 1b) Are you a Canadian citizen at least 18 years old?
- | | | |
|-----|---|------------------------------|
| Yes | 1 | CONTINUE |
| No | 2 | THANK & TERMINATE |

1c) **DO NOT ASK – NOTE GENDER (target a 50/50 split in all groups)**

Male	1
Female	2

2) I'd like to ask you some questions about your level of involvement in current issues, if you don't mind. For each of the following, I'd like you to tell me, with a yes or no response, whether you have done this in the last year.

	Yes	No
a. Made a speech to a public audience	1	2
b. Written an article for a publication.....	1	2
c. Served as an officer of a club or organization	1	2
d. Written a letter to the editor.....	1	2
e. Called a television or radio talk show	1	2
f. served as an officer of a non-governmental organization?	1	2
g. written to an elected representative?.....	1	2
h. been a member of or worked for a political party?.....	1	2
i. expressed your views on an important issue through a website or blog?.....	1	2

- Involved Canadians will say yes to at least 3 of the nine questions
- Those who say yes to 1 or less of the 9 should be recruited for the gen pop groups
- Take those who say 2 on hold for the Involved groups

3) And how old are you? Are you**READ LIST**

Under 18	0	THANK & TERMINATE
18-24	1	
25-34 years	2	WE NEED A MIX OF AGES IN EACH GROUP
35-44 years	3	
45-54	4	
55-64	5	
65 years and older	6	
Refuse	9	

3b) Could you please tell me what is the last level of education that you have completed?

Some high school only.....	1	MIX IN EACH GROUP
Completed high school.....	2	
Some College/University.....	3	
Completed College/University....	4	

4a) Are you currently....

Married/common-law.....	1	MIX IN EACH GROUP
Single/div/separated/widowed....	2	

4b) And what is your occupation? _____
TERMINATE IF OCCUPATION IN Q1a

IF MARRIED ASK Q4C)

4c) What is your spouses occupation? _____
TERMINATE IF OCCUPATION IN Q1a

5) And is your total family income... **MIX IN EACH GROUP**

Below \$30K	1
Between \$30 – 49,999K	2
\$50K-100K	3
Over \$100K	4
RF/DK	9

- 6a) The next couple of questions deal with your imagination. Have a little fun with these questions and feel free to answer in any way, as there are no incorrect answers.

Please give me three things you can do with a paper clip besides the obvious.

If you could meet anyone in the past or present, who would you like to meet and why?

ANSWERS SPONTANEOUSLY

____ VERY SURE OF HIMSELF/HERSELF
 ____ ENTHUSIASTIC
 ____ CARRIES ON A GOOD CONVERSATION

NOTE: PAY EXTRA ATTENTION TO RESPONDENTS ANSWERS-LOOK FOR A COMPLEX ANSWER. ANSWERS SHOULD ALSO BE CREATIVE AND NOT JUST ANSWERS. LOOK FOR IMAGINATION AND A SENSE OF CREATIVITY/PARTICIPATION.

- 7a) Participants in group discussions are asked to voice their opinions and thoughts, how comfortable are you in voicing your opinions in front of others? Are you (read list)

Very comfortable.....1	[min. 4 per group]
Fairly comfortable.....2	
Comfortable.....3	
Not very comfortable..4	[terminate]
Very uncomfortable....5	[terminate]

- 7b) Have you participated in a focus group? A focus group brings together a few people in order to know their opinion about a given subject.

Yes	1	ASK Q7C AND Q7D
No	2	SKIP TO Q8
Don't Know	9	THANK AND TERMINATE

- 7c) When did you last attend one of these discussions?

____ [terminate if within the last 6 months]

- 7d) Would you please tell me which topics you discussed when you attended the focus group or interviews?

IF MENTIONS ANYTHING RELATED TO BIOTECHNOLOGY – THANK AND TERMINATE

- e) And how many of these sessions have you attended?

IF Q7E>3 THANK AND TERMINATE. OTHERWISE CONTINUE.

As I mentioned earlier, the group discussion will take place the evening of, **Day, Month, Date @ Time for 2 hours** and participants will receive **\$75** for their time. Would you be willing to attend?

Yes	1	CONTINUE
No	2	THANK AND TERMINATE

That's great! Do you have a pen or pencil; I will provide you with some additional information.

City: Toronto (English) Tuesday January 16, 2007 Group #1: Gen Pop @5:30pm 1 \$75.00 Group #2: Involved Canadians @7:30pm 2 \$75.00 City: Montreal (French) Thursday January 18, 2007 Group #3: Gen Pop @5:30pm 3 \$75.00 Group #4: Involved Canadians @7:30pm 4 \$75.00 City: Edmonton (English) Monday January 29, 2007 Group #5: Gen Pop @5:30pm 5 \$75.00 Group #6: Involved Canadians @7:30pm 6 \$75.00	Rec. 10 Honorarium: \$75.00 Study # LD Code:
Respondent's name: _____ Respondent's phone #: _____ (home) Respondent's phone #: _____ (work) Respondent's fax #: _____ sent? _____ or Respondent's e-mail : _____ sent? _____ Sample source (circle): random referral	Interviewer: _____ Date: _____ Validated: _____ Quality Central: _____ On List: _____ On Quotas: _____

Invitation:

Do you have a pen handy so that I can give you the address where the group will be held? It will be held at:

Toronto: Address: TBD	Montreal: Address:
Edmonton: Address:	

We ask that you arrive fifteen minutes early to be sure you find parking, locate the facility and have time to check-in with the hosts. The hosts may be checking respondent's identification prior to the group, so please be sure to bring some personal identification with you (i.e. driver's license). Also, if you require glasses for reading, please bring them with you. The group will last no more than **2 hours** and for your time you will receive a cash honorarium of **\$75.00**.

As we are only inviting a small number of people, your participation is very important to us. If for some reason you are unable to attend, please call so that we may get someone to replace you. Please **do not** send someone in your place. You can reach us at **1-800-363-4229 ext 5068** at our office. Please ask for **Carol Smith**. Someone will call you the day before to remind you about the discussion.

So that we can call you to remind you about the focus group or contact you should there be any changes, can you please confirm your name and contact information for me? **[READ INFO WE HAVE AND CHANGE AS NECESSARY.]**

First name _____
Last Name _____
Email: _____
Day time phone number _____
Night time phone number _____

If the respondent refused to give his/her first or last name or phone number please assure them that this information will be kept strictly confidential in accordance to the privacy law and that it is used strictly to contact them to confirm their attendance and to inform them of any changes to the focus group. If they still refuse **THANK & TERMINATE**

Decima (Health Cda Biotech Jan 07 REC)

WIP # 89890100

Étude # 90237

Questionnaire # _____ Date of Last Group _____
of previous groups _____

Ville: Montréal (Français) Jeudi le 18 janvier, 2007				Recrutez: 10 Prime: 75 \$ N° d'étude # 90237 Code d'interurbain: 949	
Groupe #3: Canadiens engagés	@17h30	3	\$75.00		
Groupe #4: Grand public	@19h30	4	\$75.00		
Nom du répondant : _____				Intervieweur : _____	
N° de téléphone du répondant : _____ (maison)				Date : _____	
N° de téléphone du répondant : _____ (bureau)				Validé : _____	
N° de télécopieur du répondant : _____ envoyé? or				Fichiers centraux : _____	
Courriel du répondant : _____ envoyé?				Sur liste : _____	
Source de l'échantillon (<i>encerclez</i>) : eVox aléatoire client référence				Sur quotas : _____	

Bonjour, je m'appelle _____ et je vous téléphone d'OSI Focus Search, une firme nationale de recherche sur l'opinion publique. Nous organisons quelques groupes de discussion composés de citoyens dans le but de sonder l'opinion publique sur des enjeux d'actualité. **EXPLIQUEZ LES GROUPES DE DISCUSSION.** Environ 10 personnes prendront part à la discussion, toutes ayant été recrutées au hasard par téléphone tout comme vous. En guise de remerciement pour leur temps, nous remettrons aux participants une prime en argent de 75 \$. Toutefois, avant de vous inviter à vous joindre à nous, j'aimerais vous poser quelques questions pour m'assurer de la diversité du groupe. Puis-je vous poser quelques questions?

Oui **CONTINUEZ**
Non **DEMANDEZ SI QUELQU'UN D'AUTRE À LA MAISON SERAIT INTÉRESSÉ SI NON, REMERCEZ ET TERMINEZ**

Votre participation est volontaire. Seule votre opinion compte pour nous. Nous ne tenterons pas de vous vendre quoi que ce soit ou de vous faire changer d'idée. La discussion se déroulera sous forme de table ronde et sera animée par un professionnel de la recherche

Monitoring text:

LISEZ À TOUS : « Cet appel peut être écouté ou enregistré à des fins d'évaluation ou de contrôle de la qualité. »

CLARIFICATIONS SUPPLÉMENTAIRES AU BESOIN :

- Pour s'assurer que je (l'intervieweur) lise les questions correctement et que je recueille vos réponses avec précision;
- Pour évaluer mon (l'intervieweur) travail aux fins d'évaluation du rendement;
- Pour vérifier que le questionnaire est exact/correct (c.-à-d. évaluation de la programmation ITAO et de la méthodologie – que nous posons les bonnes questions pour répondre aux exigences de nos clients en matière de recherche – comme un prétest).
- Si l'appel est enregistré, l'enregistrement sert uniquement à évaluer le travail de l'intervieweur et est écouté immédiatement après la fin de l'entrevue. Il peut également être utilisé par le gestionnaire de projet ou le client pour évaluer le questionnaire si ces personnes n'étaient pas disponibles au moment de l'entrevue. Tous les enregistrements sont détruits après l'évaluation.

- 1a) Est-ce que vous, ou quelqu'un d'autre chez vous, travaillez pour...
Le gouvernement fédéral ou un gouvernement provincial 1
Les médias, comme un journal, une station de radio ou une chaîne de télévision 2
Une firme de publicité, de relations publiques ou de recherche marketing 3

SI « OUI » À L'UN DE CES DOMAINES, REMERCEZ ET TERMINEZ

- 1b) Êtes-vous citoyen(ne) canadien(ne) et âgé(e) d'au moins 18 ans?
Oui 1 **CONTINUEZ**
Non 2 **REMERCEZ ET TERMINEZ**

- 1c) **NE DEMANDEZ PAS – SEXE DU RÉPONDANT**
Homme 1
Femme 2

- 2) Si vous le permettez, j'aimerais vous poser quelques questions à propos de votre degré d'engagement dans les enjeux d'actualité. J'aimerais que vous me disiez, en répondant par un oui ou par un non, si vous avez fait les activités suivantes au cours de la dernière année.

	Oui	Non
a. Prononcé un discours en public.....	1	2
b. Écrit un article pour publication.....	1	2
c. Été administrateur(rice) d'une association ou d'une organisme.....	1	2
d. Écrit une lettre à une tribune libre.....	1	2
e. Téléphoné lors d'une ligne ouverte à la télévision ou à la radio.....	1	2
f. Été administrateur(trice) d'une organisation non gouvernementale.....	1	2
g. Écrit à un(e) élu(e).....	1	2
h. Été membre d'un parti politique ou avez travaillé pour un parti politique.....	1	2
i. Exprimé votre point de vue concernant des enjeux importants sur un site Web ou un blogue.....	1	2

- Les Canadien(ne)s engagé(e)s répondront oui à au moins 3 des 9 questions
- Ceux qui répondent oui à 1 question ou moins seront recrutés pour les groupes grand public
- Ceux qui répondent oui à 2 questions prenez comme back-up pour les canadien(ne)s engagé(e)s

- 3) Quel âge avez-vous? LISEZ LA LISTE

Moins de 18 ans	0	REMERCIEZ ET TERMINEZ
De 18 à 24 ans	1	
De 25 à 34 ans	2	
De 35 à 44 ans	3	
De 45 à 54 ans	4	
De 55 à 64 ans	5	
65 ans et plus	6	
Refuse	9	

- 3b) Quel est le plus haut niveau de scolarité que vous avez atteint?

Études secondaires non terminées.....	1
Études secondaires terminées.....	2
Études collégiales/universitaires non terminées....	3
Études collégiales/universitaires terminées.....	4

- 4a) À l'heure actuelle, êtes-vous....

Marié(e)/en union libre.....	1
Célibataire/divorcé(e)/séparé(e)/veuf ou veuve	2

- 4b) Quel est votre travail ou votre occupation? _____

TERMINEZ SI MENTIONNÉE À Q1a

SI MARIÉ(E), POSEZ Q4C)

- 4c) Quel est le travail ou l'occupation de votre conjoint(e)? _____

TERMINEZ SI MENTIONNÉE À Q1a

- 5) Et quel est le revenu total de votre ménage?

Moins de 30 000 \$	1
De 30 000 \$ à 49 999 \$	2
De 50 000 \$ à 100 000 \$	3
Plus de 100 000 \$	4
NE LISEZ PAS : REF/NSP	9

6a) Les prochaines questions feront appel à votre imagination. Laissez-vous aller et répondez comme bon vous semble puisqu'il n'y a pas de mauvaises réponses.

Pouvez-vous m'indiquer trois choses que l'on peut faire avec un trombone, à part s'en servir pour retenir des feuilles ensemble?

Si vous pouviez rencontrer qui vous voulez, que ce soit une personne vivante ou décédée, qui aimeriez-vous rencontrer et pourquoi?

RÉPOND SPONTANÉMENT

_____ TRÈS SÛR(E) DE LUI-MÊME OU D'ELLE-MÊME
 _____ ENTHOUSIASTE
 _____ A UNE CONVERSATION INTÉRESSANTE

NOTE : PORTEZ UNE ATTENTION SPÉCIALE AUX RÉPONSES. RECHERCHEZ DES RÉPONSES COMPLEXES. LES RÉPONSES DEVRAIENT ÊTRE CRÉATIVES ET NON SEULEMENT PRATIQUES. RECHERCHEZ DES RÉPONDANTS QUI FONT PREUVE D'IMAGINATION ET DE CRÉATIVITÉ, DES GENS QUI PARTICIPENT.

7a) Nous demandons aux participants des groupes de discussion d'exprimer leurs opinions et de verbaliser leurs pensées. Dans quelle mesure êtes-vous à l'aise d'exprimer votre opinion devant les autres? Diriez-vous que vous êtes... (LISEZ LA LISTE)

Très à l'aise	1	
Passablement à l'aise	2	
À l'aise	3	
Pas très à l'aise	4	REMERCIEZ ET TERMINEZ
Très mal à l'aise	5	REMERCIEZ ET TERMINEZ

7b) Avez-vous déjà participé à un groupe de discussion? Un groupe de discussion réunit diverses personnes dans le but d'obtenir leur opinion sur un sujet donné.

Oui	1	POSEZ Q7C ET Q7D
Non	2	PASSEZ À Q8
NSP / PDR	9	REMERCIEZ ET TERMINEZ

7c) À quand remonte votre dernière participation à un groupe de discussion?

_____ TERMINEZ SI AU COURS DES 6 DERNIERS MOIS

7d) Pouvez-vous me dire sur quoi portait l'entrevue ou le groupe de discussion auquel vous avez participé?

SI LIÉ À LA BIOTECHNOLOGIE – REMERCIEZ ET TERMINEZ

7e) Et à combien de groupes de ce genre avez-vous participé?

SI Q7E>3 REMERCIEZ ET TERMINEZ. SINON, CONTINUEZ

Group table :

Comme je l'ai mentionné plus tôt, le groupe de discussion aura lieu le, Jour, Mois, Date @ Heure et durera 2 heures. Accepteriez-vous d'y participer?

Oui	1	
Non	2	REMERCIEZ ET TERMINEZ

Ville: Montréal (Français)

Jeudi le 18 janvier, 2007

Groupe #3: Canadiens engagés	@17h30	3	\$75.00
------------------------------	--------	---	---------

Groupe #4: Grand public	@19h30	4	\$75.00
-------------------------	--------	---	---------

ENJEUX RELATIFS À LA CONFIDENTIALITÉ (including P3)

J'aurais maintenant quelques questions à vous poser à propos de la confidentialité, de vos renseignements personnels et du processus de recherche. Nous devons obtenir votre permission par rapport à certains sujets afin que nous puissions effectuer notre recherche. Lorsque je vous poserai ces questions, n'hésitez pas à me demander de les clarifier si vous en ressentez le besoin.

- P1) Tout d'abord, nous fournirons une liste des noms et des profils (réponses au questionnaire) des participants aux hôtes du groupe de discussion et au modérateur, afin qu'ils puissent vous inscrire au groupe. Acceptez-vous que nous leur transmettions ces renseignements? Je peux vous assurer que ceux-ci demeureront strictement confidentiels.

Oui	1	PASSEZ À P2
Non	2	LISEZ L'INFORMATION SUIVANTE AU RÉPONDANT

Malheureusement, nous devons donner votre nom et votre profil aux hôtes et au modérateur du groupe de discussion, puisque seuls les gens qui sont invités à participer peuvent prendre part à la discussion. Les hôtes et le modérateur ont besoin de ces renseignements à des fins de vérification uniquement. Soyez assuré(e) que ces renseignements demeureront strictement confidentiels. **PASSEZ À P1A**

- P1a) Maintenant que je vous ai expliqué cela, acceptez-vous que nous transmettions votre nom et votre profil aux hôtes et au modérateur du groupe de discussion?

Oui	1	PASSEZ À P2
Non	2	REMERCIEZ ET TERMINEZ

- P2) Il y aura un enregistrement audio/vidéo du groupe de discussion et celui-ci servira uniquement à des fins de recherche. Les enregistrements seront uniquement utilisés par un professionnel de la recherche pour préparer le rapport sur les résultats de la recherche. Les enregistrements seront détruits lorsque le rapport sera terminé.

Acceptez-vous qu'un enregistrement audio/vidéo du groupe de discussion soit effectué uniquement à des fins de recherche?

Oui	1	REMERCIEZ ET PASSEZ À P3
Non	2	LISEZ L'INFORMATION SUIVANTE AU RÉPONDANT

Malheureusement, nous devons faire un enregistrement audio/vidéo du groupe de discussion puisque le professionnel de la recherche a besoin de ce matériel pour rédiger son rapport. Je peux vous assurer que ces enregistrements demeureront strictement confidentiels et qu'ils seront détruits dès que le rapport sera terminé. **PASSEZ À P2A**

- P2a) Maintenant que je vous ai expliqué cela, acceptez-vous que nous fassions un enregistrement audio/vidéo du groupe de discussion?

Oui	1	REMERCIEZ ET PASSEZ À P3
Non	2	REMERCIEZ ET TERMINEZ

- P3) Chaque mois, FocusSearch soumet le nom des personnes qui ont participé à nos groupes de discussion au Registre central de recherche qualitative de l'Association de recherche et d'intelligence marketing (www.mria-arim.ca). Le Registre central de recherche qualitative est une base de données centrale qui vérifie la participation aux groupes de discussion de recherches qualitatives. Personne ne communiquera avec vous parce que votre nom se trouve sur cette liste.

Nous permettez-vous de soumettre votre nom et votre numéro de téléphone au Registre central de recherche qualitative de l'ARIM?

Oui	1	REMERCIEZ ET PASSEZ À L'INVITATION
Non	2	PASSEZ À P3A

- P3a) Malheureusement, afin de participer à ce groupe de discussion nous devons avoir votre permission pour ajouter votre nom au Registre central de recherche qualitative puisqu'il s'agit du seul moyen qui nous permettra d'assurer l'intégrité du processus de recherche et de faire le suivi de la participation aux recherches qualitatives. Le système est tenu à jour par l'Association professionnelle de recherche en marketing et il est uniquement utilisé pour faire le suivi de votre participation aux recherches qualitatives (comme les groupes de discussion). Vous ne serez jamais contacté parce que votre nom se trouve sur cette liste.

Maintenant que je vous ai expliqué cela, acceptez-vous que nous ajoutons votre nom à notre liste centrale de recherche qualitative?

Oui	1	REMERCIEZ ET PASSEZ À L'INVITATION
Non	2	REMERCIEZ ET TERMINEZ

AU BESOIN, RENSEIGNEMENTS SUPPLÉMENTAIRES POUR L'INTERVIEWEUR :

Soyez assuré(e) que cette information demeurera confidentielle et seules les firmes d'études de marchés professionnelles pourront y accéder et l'utiliser pour vérifier la participation et empêcher les « répondants professionnels » de participer aux groupes. Les firmes de recherche qui participent au Registre central de recherche qualitative de l'ARIM ont besoin de votre autorisation avant que vous ne soyez admissible à participer au groupe de discussion – ce système aide à assurer l'intégrité du processus de recherche.

AU BESOIN, NOTE À PROPOS DE L'ARIM :

L'Association de recherche et d'intelligence marketing est un organisme à but non lucratif qui regroupe des professionnels de la recherche en marketing impliqués dans le marketing, la publicité, les recherches sociales et politiques. La mission de l'Association est d'être le leader dans la promotion de l'excellence dans la pratique du marketing et des recherches sociales ainsi que dans la valeur de l'information sur les marchés

Invitation:

Avez-vous un crayon à portée de la main pour prendre en note l'adresse de l'endroit où se tiendra le groupe de discussion? Il aura lieu :

Montréal :**Opinion Search Inc.**

1080, côte du Beaver Hall, bureau 400, Montréal (Québec)

Entrée de l'édifice :

L'entrée se trouve sur la côte du Beaver Hall.

Pour vous rendre :

L'édifice est situé sur la côte du Beaver Hall, entre le boulevard René-Lévesque Ouest et la rue De La Gauchetière. Roulez vers l'est sur le boulevard René-Lévesque Ouest jusqu'à la côte du Beaver Hall. Tournez à droite sur la côte du Beaver Hall. Station de métro Square-Victoria.

Stationnement :

Dans la rue, municipal et intérieur

La discussion durera environ **2 heures** et vous recevrez une prime de **75 \$** en guise de remerciement pour le temps que vous nous aurez accordé.

Nous vous demandons d'arriver quinze minutes avant l'heure prévue pour vous permettre de stationner votre voiture, de trouver nos bureaux et de vous présenter à nos hôtes. Il est possible qu'on vous demande de vous identifier avant la tenue du groupe. Par conséquent, assurez-vous d'avoir une pièce d'identité avec vous. (ex. permis de conduire). De plus, si vous avez besoin de lunettes de lecture, veuillez les apporter avec vous.

Comme nous n'invitons qu'un petit nombre de personnes, votre participation est très importante pour nous. Si, pour une raison ou une autre vous ne pouvez pas vous présenter, veuillez nous en aviser pour que nous puissions vous remplacer. Vous pouvez nous joindre au 1 800 363-4229, poste 5068. Demandez à parler à **Louise Tremblay**. Quelqu'un communiquera avec vous la veille du groupe de discussion pour confirmer votre présence.

Afin que nous puissions vous appeler pour confirmer votre présence ou pour vous informer si des changements survenaient, pourriez-vous me confirmer votre nom et vos coordonnées? **[LISEZ LES COORDONNÉES QUE NOUS AVONS ET MODIFIEZ AU BESOIN.]**

Prénom _____

Nom de famille _____

Courriel _____

N° de téléphone de jour _____

N° de téléphone en soirée _____

Si le répondant refuse de donner son prénom, son nom ou son numéro de téléphone, (1 n° de téléphone c'est bien, 2 c'est mieux) veuillez lui dire que ces renseignements demeureront strictement confidentiels en vertu de la loi sur le respect de la vie privée et que ceux-ci seront uniquement utilisés pour le contacter afin de confirmer sa présence et pour l'informer de tout changement concernant le groupe de discussion. S'il refuse toujours, **REMERCIEZ ET TERMINEZ**.

#10 - PUBLIC OPINION RESEARCH INTO GENETIC PRIVACY ISSUES (2003)

AVAILABLE DOCUMENTS	
Executive Summary	#10-2003-POR Genetic Privacy Issues-Summary.pdf
Full Report	#10-2003-POR Genetic Privacy Issues-Full.pdf

PREPARED FOR / BY	
Prepared for:	Biotechnology Assistant Deputy Minister Coordinating Committee (BACC), Government of Canada
Prepared by (firm):	Pollara Research and Earncliffe Research and Communication
Prepared by (authors):	Elly Alboim, Jeff Walker , Don Guy
More information:	Elly Alboim (elly@earncliffe.ca) Jeff Walker (jwalker@earncliffe.ca) Don Guy (dguy@pollara.ca)

Methodology (2 instruments):

- a telephone survey of 1200 Canadians
- 2 focus groups to support the survey

Sample for the focus groups:

- 2 focus groups
- one night in Toronto on March 6th 2003
- one group of general population and one group of involved Canadians

Sample for the telephone survey:

- random sample of 1200 Canadians
- survey between February 10th and February 20th 2003
- national sample: margin of error of +/- 2.8%, 19 times out of 20

Objectives:

The research was commissioned to establish a baseline of opinion on a range of genetic privacy issues in order to support the work of a Government of Canada task force that is looking at policy development in the area

Areas of investigation :

- general familiarity and awareness of genetic information and privacy issues;
- willingness to undergo, and experience with genetic testing;
- perceptions of the current and preferred governance models for privacy in connection with personal genetic information;
- the role of research and potential privacy constraints on its use of genetic information;
- the degree to which insurance companies should have access to existing genetic information.

CONCLUSIONS

The results suggest that there is broad comfort with and support for a regime that balances the strict protection of personal genetic information with facilitating access to such information to gain important corollary benefits. However, that support requires consistent linkage between the substance of initiatives and the benefits to be derived or else the default position comes into play, i.e. the insistence on stringent privacy protection.

There is strong evidence from the research that an increase in knowledge about the area and discussion about it increase the conviction that the benefits of facilitating access to genetic information outweigh the drawbacks. At the end of the survey instrument – after almost 30 minutes of questioning about the issues – the question of benefits versus drawbacks was posed once again. The assessment that benefits of knowing more about our genetic information outdrew drawbacks grew from 63% to 77%.

Perhaps even more striking, Involved Canadians – those who are most likely to hear about these issues first and engage most strongly – become even more favourable than the general population. Focus group work suggests that once they are given a sense that those responsible for governing these issues are thinking about them and working to improve their governance, concerns about potential abuse or misuse abate and interest in gaining the benefits increases.